

REMARKS

In the Office Action of February 14, 2005, the Examiner rejected claims 19, 21, 25-29 and 31-34 and allowed claims 1-14, 16-18 and 22-24, 30 and 35-42.

The Examiner indicated the allowability of claims 19 and 21 if corrected to overcome a 35 U.S.C. §112 problem.

The Examiner objected to the drawings under 37 CFR 1.83(a). Applicants provide formal drawings concurrently herewith. Figure 7 illustrates in section the side members 12a, 12b fit within the recessed rails 56a, 54b. Some additional references have been added to Figure 7 for clarity.

The Examiner first rejected claims 19 and 21 under 35 USC 112 as being indefinite for failing to point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicants regard as the invention because claim 19 lacked clear antecedent for "said recessed rails." Applicants have amended claim 19 to correct this antecedent problem.

The Examiner next rejected claims 25, 31-32 under 35 USC §103(a) as being unpatentable over *Harris*. Applicants have amended claim 25 to more clearly describe the recessed rails and corresponding side member. *Harris* describes sills 63 wherein a back wall 51 is secured by rivots 100 via rivot holes 52 to a sidewall of the sill 63 (Figures 3 and 5). The sill 63 is part of the cab frame and is attached to sill surfaces 39 of the floor panel 35. The sills 63 are not fit into a recess as claimed in claim 25 nor does the member 51 have a rectangular cross section that is sized to fit within a recess (see Figure 5).

The Examiner next rejected claims 33 and 34 under 35 USC §103(a) as being unpatentable over *Harris*. However based on the asserted allowability of claim 25 these claims should be allowable as well.

The Examiner next rejected claims 26-28 under 35 USC §103(a) as being unpatentable over *Harris* in view of *Taylor*. However based on the asserted allowability of claim 25 these claims should be allowable as well.

The Examiner next rejected claim 29 under 35 USC §103(a) as being unpatentable over *Harris* in view of *Bonnett et al.* However based on the asserted allowability of claim 25 these claims should be allowable as well.

The Examiner next indicated that claims 1-14, 16-18 and 22-24, 30 and 35-42 are allowed. Applicants acknowledge this allowance with appreciation.

The Examiner next indicated that claims 19 and 21 would be allowable if corrected to overcome the 35 U.S.C. §112 rejection. Applicants have amended claim 19 accordingly and as such these claims should now be allowable.

Applicants assert that all claims are now in condition for allowance and request issuance of the application.

Respectfully submitted;

By: 

Randall T. Erickson, Reg. No. 33,872

The Law Office Of Randall T. Erickson, P.C.
425 W. Wesley St., Suite 1
Wheaton, Illinois 60187
Phone (630) 665-9404
Fax: (630) 665-9414
Customer No. 41528